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**The concept of citizenship in times of social inequality: guidelines for an inclusive education.**

**ABSTRACT**

This article aims to analyse the existing approach to Citizenship Education against the backdrop of social inequality in this global era. It offers a conceptual revision of modern Citizenship and highlights the need for a change of perspective in order to understand Citizenship, taking into account the changing social landscapes of recent decades and the dominance of the neoliberal economic model, which has caused increased inequality on a global scale. Building on this re-conceptualisation, this article conducts a documentary analysis of selected Ibero-American educational projects chosen due to their aims of creating Citizenship through inclusive models. From this analysis follows a discussion of the findings of these projects, of key elements shown to foster an inclusive approach to Citizenship through education, and of the potential of this inclusive approach to reduce social inequality.
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1. **Globalisation and Social Inequality**

Unequal access to the basic resources needed to live and to guarantee the exercise of citizens’ rights is not a new phenomenon. However, the rapidly widening social gap between the rich and the poor has, in recent decades, become a distinctive characteristic of our times. To better understand this issue, it is necessary to remember that the lives of people across the world have been affected by a myriad of social, political and economic changes which have been acknowledged as characteristics of globalisation itself.

Since the 1990s globalisation has been defined as a phenomenon in which economic, social and cultural processes become ever more interdependent (Castles, 1997; Castells, 2001). Thus, events occurring in one part of the world have consequences in other parts, instantly affecting people’s lives. The fundamental principles of globalisation can be divided into four key areas: technological innovation, market-orientation, increased permeability of borders and the hegemony of the neoliberal model as a regulatory framework for economic and social relations (Ramírez, 2011). This means that, through transformations in Communications Technologies, globalisation allows instant awareness of world affairs and facilitates personal and professional relationships across the globe. This interconnectedness has led to the expansion of commercial relationships and border permeability, allowing cross-border commercial transactions of all kinds to take place.

The neoliberal model has been the predominant approach to economic and social organisation in modern society. Under this model, activities aimed at promoting social wellbeing are increasingly submitted to market-oriented approaches. As a result, those who have the necessary resources to evolve apace with the market benefit from these forms of globalisation. However, those denied a voice in the decision making which regulates the markets, and those who are unable to evolve, may be excluded from the benefits that technological innovation and more penetrable borders have to offer. Furthermore, their fundamental rights become unprotected. This *lack of voice* results in exclusion from social dynamics and interactions as well as from various participation processes (Sabariego, 2009). In this way, there are those who remain *within* these dynamics, while the rest drift ever further from the very processes designed to ensure their development and well-being.

In this era of globalisation, the social gap between those *included* and those *excluded* is widening at an increasing pace. Consequently, the number of people living with poverty, social vulnerability, corruption, increased risk, humiliation and violations of dignity is increasing even in groups of individuals who do enjoy mobility, freedom of choice and multiple options (Bauman, 2011). In contrast to the advantages which the consequences of globalisation appear to have for all, it has produced a new geography of centrality and marginality (Sassen, 2007) in which levels of unemployment and poverty are increasing (Anchustegui, 2012), and where the structural asymmetry between the global North and South; between the poorest and the richest countries, is remarkably prominent (Guerra, 2012; Romero and Romero, 2013). Therefore, we see a loss of rights for the poorest and lowest paid (Sassen, 2016), as well as the fracturing of the regulations which once protected workers’ rights, creating a dynamic of exploitation and instability (Sassen, 2007). This picture of inequality has a major impact on social cohesion and social dynamics, where the *losers of globalisation* (Pausch, 2016) not only remain on the margins of wellbeing, but also are vulnerable to extremist groups or to organised crime, thereby widening the tear in the fabric of society.

In this way, the primary consequence of globalisation has been an increase in inequality on a world scale, which in turn has impacted upon global social dynamics. The primary evidence of this inequality is found in the following points: (Sassen, 2007; Bauman, 2011; Anchustegui, 2012; Florentino, 2014):

* The concentration of economic power within small target groups, which results in large-scale increases in unemployment and fragmented job markets where low wages for a high volume of workers are the norm. This has expanded the informal sector of the economy, where job and earnings uncertainty and flexibility are more prevalent.
* An increase in instability extending from employment to other aspects such as housing, health, education or access to electricity. One characteristic of the neoliberal model, which has been adopted globally, is privatisation. When privatised, the aforementioned aspects cease to be basic rights and become consumable goods. Thus, their attainment depends upon the purchasing power of the individual.
* Instability and uncertainty become constant. The volatility of the markets makes them unreliable. Thus, those who are economically competent fight to maintain their position whereas the rest focus on surviving with the resources available to them. In this way the poorest suffer the most from constant insecurity.

Thus, the current picture is one of a world that is technologically more connected, with instant fluidity of personal and commercial relationships, and where advantageous global transformations can be triggered from any part of the world. Current global interconnectedness offers unprecedented opportunities for social and economic growth. However, these opportunities remain firmly in the hands of the few.

***1.1 Mapping out social inequality: from a world perspective to an Ibero-American one.***

The widening of the social gap appears to be keeping pace with the advance of Communications Technologies and with the diverse forms of global, social and economic interconnectedness. According to Oxfam (2016), between 2010 and 2015 the number of richest people in the world dropped from 388 to 62. These 62 control the same wealth as the poorest 3.6 billion. Equally since the beginning of the 20th century the poorest of the world’s population have received just 1% of the total increase in global wealth, whereas half of that increase has gone to the richest 1%. According to Oxfam’s predictions, the richest 1% have now accumulated more wealth than the other 99% of the world put together.

Strikingly, Latin America has been defined as the most unequal region on the planet (Blanco and Duk, 2011; Gentili, 2011). To that effect, Oxfam and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) have declared that between 2002 and 2015 the fortunes of Latin American multimillionaires have grown by 21% per year, which represents an increase six times that of the whole region (Ruíz et al., 2016), so that for the year 2014, the richest 10% of Latin Americans owned 71% of the region’s wealth. On the other hand, in the same year ECLAC estimated that 28.2% of the Latin American population lived in poverty, and 11.8% in destitution. Likewise, in 2013 they estimated that in a group of 20 to 24 year olds, those who had completed their secondary education had higher incomes than the 34% who had not.

In the case of Spain, social inequality increased significantly between 2001 and 2011. During this period, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) estimated that the real incomes of the poorest members of the population decreased by 13% whilst for the richest 10% there was only a 1.4% decrease. In the same way, 10% of the population possessed 43% of the country’s wealth, whilst only 20% of the wealth belonged to the poorest 60% of the population. Similarly, the European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN) has estimated that earnings, spending and employment opportunities have reduced since 2007, resulting in 29.2% of the population being at risk of poverty or exclusion in 2014 (Llano, 2015). Equally, during this period, the number of people suffering from severe material deprivation increased by 14.5%.

Against this backdrop it is worth re-evaluating the current concept of Citizenship, taking into account the fact that the quantity of people who can exercise their citizens’ rights fully has declined and that the gap between the poorest and the richest sectors of society has widened alarmingly. Thus, it is necessary to rethink the Citizenship models in force since the 20th century and analyse new possibilities which relate better to the current social environment.

**2. Global Citizenship: a change in perspective.**

The economic and social environment which exists in this age of globalisation brings into question the basic principles which associate Citizenship with a formal status of belonging to a nation-state. The prospect of a social policy based on the need for state intervention to protect the rights of a citizen withers when faced with a reality in which this protection has given rise to a social and economic relationship based on market rules. The approach to social policy established in Western Europe for more than half a century highlights the need to guarantee minimum living conditions to ensure equality in exercising one’s rights as a citizen (Cossio, 1989). Citizenship is established through active participation on public issues. Consequently, it is a form of democratic and political life shared between those who have formal recognition of their citizenship in a determined state (Anchustegul, 2012). Nevertheless, the profound inequality which currently exists on a global scale is evidence of the difficulties millions of people face in being effective citizens within their societies.

The neoliberal model, which promotes commercial freedom, has allowed private sector actors to provide citizens – now viewed as consumers – with essential services for development and quality of life. Thus, the State ceases to be the body responsible for wellbeing and becomes a regulator of these private actors. From this perspective, and taking into account the increase in inequality, full exercise of citizenship is only possible for certain people. Consequently, the possibility of exercising Citizenship beyond the formal bounds of a political order, or a determined territory, is a key aspect of citizenship which must be considered in the global era (Anchustegui, 2012; Nierderberger, 2012; Florentino, 2014). This is due to the social justice requirements which our current situation demands. Thus, it is not sufficient to hold the status of citizen within a State. It is just as necessary to meet minimum living conditions as it is to provide selected goods, services and choices in order for citizens to *belong* to a society and not be *excluded* from it. Based on this assumption, “citizenship should imply that everyone is in a position to participate in democracy and has certain rights […]’ (Nierderberger, 2012: 144).

The consequences of globalisation, and the hegemony of the neoliberal model as one of its characteristics, exceed the ability of the State to ensure that all its members are capable of exercising their citizens’ rights. Thus, millions all over the world have difficulties in developing themselves and participating actively in their society and in influencing and being part of their environment. Therefore, it becomes necessary to expand the scope of citizenship in this global age despite the inequalities which are embedded within it.

Besides broadening the concept of Citizenship beyond simply a legal status, it is necessary to see other factors associated with it which provide further opportunities for exercising one’s rights despite the existing social gap. In this way, citizenship begins to refer to a feeling of belonging to humanity, which in turn causes people to experience feelings of collective, global solidarity and responsibility (UNESCO, 2013). Moreover, it can be defined as a form of understanding how the world works and how to relate to others in order to function within it (Brigham, 2011).
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